

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

Joseph F. Harkins, Secretary

RCRA COMPLIANCE INSPECTION REPORT

TRANSPORTERS CHECKLIST

RECEIVED
Forbes Field
BUREAU OF
Topeka, Kansas 66620
913-862-9360

APR 30 1982

ENVIRONMENTAL
SANITATION



A. General

Date October 5, 1981 Time 9:00 a.m. EPA ID No. KSD 000000810

Facility Name Reid Supply Co.

Street 911 E. Indianapolis

City Wichita, Kansas Zip 67211

County Sedgwick Phone (316) 267-1231

Contact Richard Pretzel - Chemical Engineer

Inspector Dale T. Stuckey - Field Representative

Other _____

B. Manifests



R00001491

RCRA Records Center

3.20 1. Do copies of manifests include:

a. Name and address of transporter?

☒ YES ☐ NO

b. Name, address, phone number, and EPA ID number of generator?

☒ YES ☐ NO

c. Name, address, and EPA ID number of designated facility?

☒ YES ☐ NO

d. Manifest document number?

☒ YES ☐ NO

e. Waste information required by DOT - shipping name, total quantity, type and number of containers?

☒ YES ☐ NO

f. Signature of subsequent transporters if any?

YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

g. Signature signifying proper delivery or reason why delivery could not be certified?

☒ YES ☐ NO

2. If the transporter transports wastes outside of U.S. do manifests show date waste left U.S.?

YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

C. Recordkeeping

3.22 1. Does transporter keep copy of the manifest signed by generator, himself, and the next designated transporter or owner of T/S/D facility for three years?

☒ YES ☐ NO

D. Containers

1. Are containers properly labeled and marked (262.31 and 262.32)?

YES) NO

E. Vehicles

1. Are vehicles placarded properly (49 CFR 172.500)?

YES NO

F. Waste Oil Collection

1. Is the company a waste oil collector in Kansas?

YES (NO

a. If yes, are waste oil transporter's logs being used?

YES NO NA

b. Are the completed logs retained for three years?

YES NO NA

Additional Information:

1. The first part of the document is a header section containing the following information:
 a. The name of the organization: "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration"
 b. The title of the document: "Report of the Committee on the Status of the Space Program"
 c. The date of the report: "January 1966"
 d. The author: "The Committee on the Status of the Space Program"
 e. The location: "Washington, D. C."

2. The second part of the document is a table of contents, which lists the following sections and their corresponding page numbers:
 a. Introduction: 1
 b. The Space Program: 2
 c. The Status of the Space Program: 3
 d. The Future of the Space Program: 4
 e. Conclusion: 5

3. The third part of the document is the main body of the report, which is divided into five sections:
 a. Introduction: This section discusses the importance of the space program and the role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).
 b. The Space Program: This section provides a detailed overview of the space program, including the various missions and the progress made to date.
 c. The Status of the Space Program: This section discusses the current status of the space program, including the challenges faced and the progress made.
 d. The Future of the Space Program: This section discusses the future of the space program, including the goals and the challenges ahead.
 e. Conclusion: This section provides a summary of the findings of the report and offers recommendations for the future of the space program.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

Joseph F. Harkins, Secretary

Forbes Field
Topeka, Kansas 66620
913-862-9360



RCRA Compliance Inspection Report

T/S/D Facilities Checklist

RECEIVED
BUREAU OF

APR 30 1982

ENVIRONMENTAL
SANITATION

A. General

Date Oct. 5, 1981 Time 9:00 a.m. EPA ID No. KSD 000000810
Facility Name Reid Supply Co.
Street 911 E. Indianapolis
City Wichita, Kansas Zip 67211
County Sedgwick Phone (316) 267-1231
Contact Richard Pretzel - Chemical Engineer
Inspector Dale T. Stuckey - Field Representative
Other _____

B. Activity at Site

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Storage</u>	<u>Disposal</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Chem/Phys/Bio Treatment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drums	<input type="checkbox"/> Incineration
<input type="checkbox"/> Filtration	<input type="checkbox"/> Pile	<input type="checkbox"/> Landfill
<input type="checkbox"/> Incineration	<input type="checkbox"/> Surface Impoundment	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Treatment
<input type="checkbox"/> Recycling/Recovery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tank, Above ground	<input type="checkbox"/> Surface Impoundment
<input type="checkbox"/> Reprocessing	<input type="checkbox"/> Tank, Below Ground	<input type="checkbox"/> Other()
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Solvent Recovery	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ()	
<input type="checkbox"/> Thermal Treatment		
<input type="checkbox"/> Volume Reduction		
<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Oil		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other ()		

2-4500 gallon vertical
storage tanks for waste
solvent

Will not actually be recycling until their new still is installed sometime this winter. Waste bulk solvent now is being sent to vacuum and pressure Tank Truck Services in Tulsa, and drummed solvent is being sent to Solvent Recovery Inc. in Kansas City, MO.

Comments: They also have a sludge processing area where drums containing a bottom layer of sludge are deheaded, the free solvent poured out and transferred to one of the 4500 gallon vertical storage tanks, and the sludge transferred to DOT drums reconditioned by S.D.S. in El Dorado. These drums of sludge are eventually sent to a BFI landfill in Louisiana.

C. * Waste Analysis Plan

265.13

1. Does facility maintain a copy of its waste analysis plan at the facility?

YES NO

A. If yes, does the plan include:

They will set up a contract with either Means' Laboratory or Wilson Laboratory.

They run distillation on each incoming waste stream and they do feed sample analysis on each new customer.

In the past, BFI or Means Laboratory had run all the analyses.

1. Parameters for which each hazardous waste will be analyzed.
2. Test methods which are used to test for these parameters.
3. Sampling method used to obtain sample.
4. Frequency with which the initial analysis will be reviewed or repeated to ensure the analysis is current.
5. For off-site facilities, the waste analyses that generators have agreed to supply.
6. For off-site facilities, the procedures which are used to inspect and analyze each movement of hazardous waste received to ensure that it matches the identity of the waste designated on the manifest.

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

* In compliance

D. Security

265.14

1. Does the facility provide:

- a) A 24-hour surveillance system? (T.V. monitoring or guards).
- b) An artificial or natural barrier (fence, fence and cliff combination) and a means to control entry (attendant, T.V. monitoring, locked entrance, controlled roadway access).
- c) Warning signs at entrances.

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

2. Does the facility consider itself exempt from security requirements?

YES NO

E. General Inspection Requirements

265.15 1. Does the owner/operator maintain a written schedule at the facility for inspecting:

- a) Monitoring equipment
- b) Safety and emergency equipment
- c) Security devices
- d) Operating and structural equipment

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ NA

☒ YES ☐ NO

2. Does the inspection schedule identify the types of problems which are to be looked for during the inspections?

☒ YES ☐ NO

3. Does the owner/operator maintain an inspection log?

☒ YES ☐ NO

a) If yes, does the log contain the:

- 1. Date and time of inspection
- 2. Name of inspector
- 3. Notation of observations
- 4. Date and nature of repairs or remedial action

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

F. Personnel Training

265.16 1. Does the owner/operator maintain at the facility, the following documents and records:

- a) Job title and job description for each position related to hazardous waste management.
- b) Description of type and amount of training to be given each person.
- c) Records of training given to facility personnel.

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

☒ YES ☐ NO

* In compliance

G. Requirements For Ignitable, Reactive, or Incompatible Wastes

265.17 1. Does the facility handle ignitable or reactive wastes?

☒ YES ☐ NO

a) If yes, is the waste separated and confined from sources of ignition or reaction, sparks, spontaneous ignition, and radiant heat?

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NA

2. Are smoking and open flames confined to specially designated locations?

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NA

3. Are "No Smoking" signs posted in hazard areas?

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ NA

4. Does a check of these areas show any leakage or corrosion of containers?
5. Does a check of these areas show evidence of heat generation from interaction of incompatible wastes?

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA

H. Preparedness and Prevention

- 265.31 1. Does an inspection of the facility show any evidence of fire, explosion, or contamination?

YES ☒ NO ☐

- 265.32 2. Is the facility equipped with:

a) Internal communication or alarm system easily accessible in case of emergency?

YES ☒ NO ☐

b. Telephone, hand-held two-way radio capable of summoning emergency response personnel?

YES ☒ NO ☐

3. Are portable fire extinguishers, fire control equipment, spill control equipment, and decontamination equipment provided?

Fiber drums contain petro-absorbant for spilt solvents

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA ☐

- 265.33 a) Is this equipment tested and maintained to assure its proper operation?

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA ☐

4. Is water of adequate volume provided for hose streams, foam producing equipment, sprinklers, etc.?

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA ☐

- 265.35 5. Does a check of the facility show sufficient aisle space to allow unobstructed movement of personnel and equipment?

YES ☒ NO ☐ NA ☐

- 265.37 6. Has the owner/operator made arrangements with the local emergency authorities to familiarize them with the layout of facility, properties of wastes handled and associated hazards, places where facility personnel normally work, entrances to roads inside facility, and possible evacuation routes?

Fire department came on tour in July

YES ☒ NO ☐

7. In areas where more than one police and fire department might respond, is there one designated authority?

YES ☐ NO ☒ NA ☐

8. Does the owner/operator have agreements with state emergency response teams, emergency response contractors, and equipment suppliers?

YES ☒ NO ☐

9. Has the owner/operator arranged to familiarize local hospitals with the properties of hazardous waste(s) handled and types of injuries which could result from fires, explosions, or releases at the facility?

Set up with Broadway clinic and Wesley Hospital

YES ☒ NO ☐

10. In cases where state or local authorities decline to enter into such arrangements, is the refusal entered in the operating record?

YES ☐ NO ☒ NA ☐

I. Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures

- 262.53 1. Is a contingency plan maintained at the facility? YES NO
- 262.52 2. Does the plan describe arrangements made with emergency response personnel? YES NO
3. Does the plan list the name(s), address(es), and phone number(s) of the designated emergency coordinator(s)? YES NO
- 265.55 4. Is an emergency coordinator available at all times? YES NO
5. Does the plan include a list of all emergency equipment at the facility and where this equipment is required? YES NO
6. Does the plan include an evacuation plan for facility personnel? YES NO ?

J. Manifest System, Record Keeping, and Reporting

- 265.71 1. Does the facility receive waste from off-site? YES NO
- a. If yes, does the owner/operator sign and date each copy of the manifest and give a signed copy to the transporter? YES NO NA
- b. Does the owner/operator send a signed copy of the manifest to the generator within 30 days of the delivery? YES NO NA
- c. Does the owner/operator retain a copy of manifest? YES NO NA
2. Does the facility receive any waste from a rail or water (bulk shipment) transporter? YES NO
- a. If yes, is the shipment accompanied by a shipping paper containing the appropriate information? YES NO NA
1. If yes, does the owner/operator sign and date the shipping paper and provide the transporter with a copy? YES NO NA
2. Does the owner/operator send a signed copy of the shipping paper to the generator within 30 days of the delivery? YES NO NA
3. Does the owner/operator retain a copy of the shipping paper? YES NO NA
- 365.72 3. Has the facility received any shipments of waste which were inconsistent with the manifest? YES NO
- a. If yes, was an attempt made to reconcile the discrepancy with the generator and transporter? YES NO NA
1. If no, was the Regional Administrator notified? YES NO NA

Salesman got
in contact with
the customers

265.73

4. Does the owner/operator keep a written operating record at the facility?

YES NO

- a. If yes, does the operation record include:

They have receiving, processing, handling, and disposition forms that track wastes from entry to recycling

1. A description and the quantity of each hazardous waste received, and method(s) and date(s) of its treatment, storage, and disposal?
2. The location of each hazardous waste within the facility and the quantity at each location?
3. Records and results of waste analyses?
4. Reports and details of incidents requiring implementation of the contingency plan?
5. Records and results of required inspections?
6. Monitoring, testing, or analytical data?
7. Closure cost estimates (and for disposal facilities, post-closure cost estimates)? (Required after 5-19-81)

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

YES NO NA

265.76

5. Has the facility received any waste, which does not fall under the small generator exclusion, not accompanied by a manifest?

YES NO

- a. If yes, was an unmanifested waste report submitted to the Regional Administrator?

YES NO NA

K. Closure and Post-Closure

265.112

1. Does the owner/operator have a written closure plan for the facility? (Required after 5-19-81)

YES NO

- a. If yes, does the plan include:

1. A description of how and when the facility will be closed?
2. An estimate of the maximum inventory of wastes in storage or in treatment at any given time during the facility life?
3. A description of the steps needed to decontaminate facility equipment at the time of closure?
4. A schedule for final closure which includes the anticipated date when wastes will no longer be received, the date when final closure is anticipated, and intervening dates which allow tracking closure progress?

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

YES NO

265.118

2. If the facility is a disposal facility, does the owner/operator have a written post-closure plan? (Required after 5-19-81)

YES NO ☒ NA

- a. If yes, does the plan include:

1. Ground-water monitoring activities and frequencies?

YES NO NA

2. Maintenance activities and frequencies to ensure the integrity of the cap and containment structures where applicable, and the function of the monitoring equipment?

YES NO NA

3. The name, address, and phone number of the person or office to contact during the post-closure period?

YES NO NA

L. Financial Requirements

☒ NA

- 265.142 1. Does the owner/operator have a written estimate of the closure cost? (Required after 7-13-81)

YES NO

- 264.143 2. Has the owner/operator established financial assurance for facility closure and notified the Regional Administrator?

YES NO

- 265.144 3. If the facility is a disposal facility, does the owner/operator have a written estimate of the annual cost of post-closure monitoring and maintenance of the facility? (Required after 7-13-81)

YES NO NA

- 264.145 4. Has the owner/operator of the disposal facility established financial assurance for post-closure care and notified the Regional Administrator?

YES NO NA

- 264.147 5. Has the owner/operator obtained liability insurance for sudden occurrences of at least \$1 million with an aggregate of at least \$2 million exclusive of legal defense costs?

YES NO

Additional Information My original inspection was on Sept. 2, 1981. At that time, there were numerous problems in the areas of inspection schedule and log, personnel training, closure plan, and a backlog of drums, awaiting recycling, which far exceeded the process design capacity for this facility listed on the Part A application. Since that time, the problems have been largely corrected as verified by another inspection visit by myself on October 5, 1981. The information filled in on this checklist represents the facility situation as of October 5, 1981.

The facility is basically in compliance excepting the lack of closure cost estimates and the fact that number of drums on site are still in excess of the process design capacity. Both of these situations will be rectified shortly, according to Richard Pretzel.

Note: Fill out applicable check lists for specific facility types.